

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 4 and 16 remain pending.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boers, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0022244 (Boers) in view of Jain, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0079040 (Jain) and Li, U.S. Patent No. 6,597,703 (Li). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boers in view of Jain, Basilier, U.S. Patent No. 7,061,880 (Basilier) and Li. The Applicants traverse these rejections as follows.

Setting aside the alleged relevance of Boers, Li and Basilier, the Applicants focus their distinguishing arguments on the teachings of Jain upon which each rejection relies. The Applicants note particularly the second paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action, wherein Jain is cited as teaching packet forwarding information comprising a designated address of a source server of a multicast group, determined by a translation unit on the basis of an address of said one of said multicast client nodes. The Examiner cites pages 2, paragraph 25; page 3, paragraph 30; page 4, paragraph 45; and page 5, paragraph 63, with emphasis on the source address of the multicast sender/transmitter end station.

Paragraph 25 on page 2 of Jain discloses details of a switch 100. Paragraph 30 discloses designated devices, including I/O ports 102 and neighboring switch interfaces 120, together with connections therebetween. Paragraph 45 describes a step 215 in which forwarding engine 118 transfers a join/prune message from a packet processor 104 to a CPU 112, which processes the join/prune message to construct or update one or more FID tables within forwarding CAM 106.

Thus, the Office Action relies particularly on paragraph 63, page 5 of Jain as disclosing “on the basis of an address of said one of said multicast client nodes.” However, this paragraph discloses a step 309 in which switch 100 is operating with explicit source distributions, and packet processor 104 extracts an explicit source lookup key from the content packet. The explicit source lookup key is based on the source IP address, destination IP address, protocol type derived from the multicast packet, and incoming I/O port 102 that received the packet. Jain is silent about an address of a client node, as required by the quoted passage of claim 4. Although the Applicants note the Examiner’s citation to Jain’s source IP address derived from the multicast packet, such is not an address of a client node, but an address of a source that sends the multicast packet. Further, Jain’s destination IP address derived from the multicast packet is an address of a multicast group, and not a client node. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable from the combination including Jain.

Similarly, claim 16 recites that an address of the multicast source server of the source-specific multicast group is determined by the translation unit on the basis of an address of said one of said multicast client nodes and an address of the multicast group to which said any-source type of request of joining or leaving was sent from said multicast node. Based on the foregoing argument, claim 16 is also distinguishable from the combination including Jain.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing

of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Brundidge & Stanger, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888 (referencing attorney docket no. NIT-378).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/Daniel J. Stanger/
Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1470